



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/668,145	09/25/2000	Theodore Rappaport		1614
	90 10/07/2004		EXAMINER	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C. 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD			DONAGHUE, LARRY D	
SUITE 340			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RESTON, VA	20190		2154	
			DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



			(
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
0.00	09/668,145	RAPPAPORT ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Larry D Donaghue	2154	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address -	-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a soly within the statutory minimum of thin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed  ty (30) days will be considered timely.  ITHS from the mailing date of this communica  3ANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).	tion.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 J	<u>lune 2004</u> .		
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☒ This	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under a condition.		•	is
Disposition of Claims			
4)	a <u>nd 103-127</u> is/are withdraw cted.	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received. Es have been received in A Firity documents have been Fu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
			٥
Attachment(s)	_		
) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Discrete Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/10/03, 08/19/03.		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

Art Unit: 2154

- 1. Claims 1-127 are presented for examination.
- 2. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 12-39, 57-58 and 75-102 in the reply filed on 14 June 2004 is acknowledged.
- 3. Claims 1-11, 40-56, 59-74, and 103-127 have withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 14 June 2004.
- 4. The information disclosure statement filed 11/12/03 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because failed to supply a copy of the non-patent literature of pages 11-15. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).
- 5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 12-19, 29-34, 57-58, 75-82 and 92-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Skidmore (A Comprehensive In-Building and Microcellular Wireless Communication System Design Tool).

Skidmore taught the invention (claim 12, 29, 75, and 92) as claimed including generating a computerized model of a communications network within a physical space in which said communications network is or will be deployed, said computerized model identifying locations within said physical space of components used in said communications network, said computerized model having modeled attributes for each of said components; positioning data collection measurement devices within said physical space; identifying locations within said

computerized model which correspond to said measurement devices; measuring field measurement data with said data collection measurement devices; and predicting a performance metric for said communications network based on said field measurement data, said modeled attributes for said components, and said locations of said components within said computerized model (chapters 1-5).

As to claim 13, 30, 76, and 93, Skidmore taught the computerized model is three dimensional (Section 3.2.2).

As to claims 14, 31, 77, and 94, Skidmore taught the data collection measurement devices used in said positioning step are portable (section 5.2.1).

Claims 15, 32, 78 and 95 are rejected as it is an equivalent apparatus for performing the same step as in claims 14, 31, 76 and 93.

As to claim 16, 33, 79 and 96 Skidmore taught the performance metric predicted in said predicting step is selected from the group consisting of throughput, error rates, packet latency, packet jitter, symbol jitter, quality of service, security, coverage area, bandwidth, bit error rate, packet error rate, frame error rate, dropped packet rate, queuing delay, round trip time, capacity, signal level, interference level, bandwidth delay product, handoff delay time, signal-to interface ratio, signal-to-noise ratio, physical equipment price, and cost information (Chapter 4).

As to claim 17 and 82 Skidmore taught step of measuring is performed manually (5.2.1.2).

Claims 18 and 83 are rejected as it is an equivalent means for performing the same step as in claims 17 and 82.

- As to claims 19, 34, 82, and 97 Skidmore taught the step of storing said field measurement data (section 5.22).
  - Claims 57-58 fail to teach or define above or beyond claims 12-19, 29-34,75-82 and 92-97
- 7. Claims 29, 34- 39, and 92,97- 102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Skidmore et al. (6,442,507)

The applied reference has a common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Skidmore et al. taught a computerized model which shows a communications network within a physical space in which said communications network is or will be deployed, said computerized model identifying locations within said physical space of components used in said communications network, said computerized model having modeled attributes for each of said components; data collection measurement devices positioned within said physical space, said data collection measurement devices being represented within said computerized model at locations that correspond to said data collection measurement devices, said data collection measurement devices measuring field measurement data for said physical space; and means for predicting a performance metric for said communications network based on said field measurement data, said modeled attributes for said components, and said locations of said components within said computerized model (col. 2, line 25-60, col. 3, line 13-40).

Art Unit: 2154

As to claims 34, and 97 Skidmore et al. taught the step of storing said field measurement data (col. 8, lines 30-36).

As to claims 35, and 98 Skidmore et al. taught said computerized model is stored on at least one server (col. 8, lines 30-36).

As to claims 36, and 99 Skidmore et al. taught said computerized model is stored on a plurality of servers, said plurality of servers can communicate with each other (col. 8, lines 30-43).

As to claims 37, and 100 Skidmore et al. taught said plurality of servers have a hierarchical relationship to one another in said system (col. 8, lines 30-43).

As to claims 38, and 101 Skidmore et al. at least one portable client device, said at least one portable client device can communicate with said at least one server (col. 8, lines 30-43).

As to claims 39, and 102 Skidmore et al. said system includes a plurality of portable client devices (col. 8, lines 30-43).

8. Claims 12, 20-28 and 75, 83-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rappaport et al. 6,625,454

Rappaport et al. taught the invention (claim 12, and 92) as claimed including generating a computerized model of a communications network within a physical space in which said communications network is or will be deployed, said computerized model identifying locations within said physical space of components used in said communications network, said computerized model having modeled attributes for each of said components; positioning data collection measurement devices within said physical space; identifying locations within said computerized model which correspond to said measurement devices; measuring field measurement data with said data collection measurement devices; and predicting a performance metric for said communications network based on said field measurement data, said modeled attributes for said components, and said locations of said components within said computerized model (figures 5-7, and corresponding disclosure).

As to claims 20 and 83, Rappaport et al. taught the step of updating said computerized model generated in said generating step (col. 9, line 4 – col. 10, line 23).

As to claims 21 and 84, Rappaport et al. taught said step of updating includes the steps of: specifying components from a plurality of different modeled components which are to be used in said communications network, said modeled components including descriptions and attributes of a specific component; and specifying locations within said physical space for a plurality of different components in said computerized model (col. 9, line 4 – col. 10, line 23)..

As to claims 22 and 85, Rappaport et al. taught said step of updating further includes the step of specifying an orientation for at least one component specified in said first specifying step at said location specified in said second specifying step (col. 9, line 4 - col. 10, line 23).

As to claims 23 and 86, Rappaport et al. taught computerized model in said generating step identifies orientations of said components at said locations within said physical space and said predicting step utilizes said orientations (col. 9, line 4 – col. 10, line 23).

Art Unit: 2154

As to claims 24 and 87, Rappaport et al. taught said computerized model generated in said generating step includes objects which create noise or interference, said noise or interference being an attribute of said object which is factored in said predicting step(col. 9, line 4 – col. 10, line 23).

As to claims 25 and 88, Rappaport et al. taught the performance metric predicted in said predicting step is predicted in a forward direction in said communication network (col. 12, lines 18-42).

As to claims 26 and 89, Rappaport et al. taught the performance metric predicted in said predicting step is predicted in a reverse direction in said communication network (col. 12, lines 18-42).

As to claims 27 and 90, Rappaport et al. taught the step of specifying data transfer protocol, and wherein said predicting step uses a specified data transfer protocol as a factor in predicting said performance metric (col. 14, lines 32-63).

As to claims 28 and 91, Rappaport et al. taught the step of specifying a network loading for said communications network, and wherein said predicting step uses a specified network loading in predicting said performance metric (col. 14, lines 32-63).

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rappaport et al.

6,499,006

Rappaport et al.

6,493,679

Rappaport et al.

6,317,599

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry D Donaghue whose telephone number is 703-305-9675. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2154

